App. No.:   10/065543   Page 3 of 3
Filed: October 29, 2002
Conf. No.:   7672

REMARKS

The foregoing amendment was submitted to the Examiner informally, as applicants' attorney had hoped to interview the Examiner on June 11, 2003. However he had to cancel this trip and was unable to conduct a phone interview with the Examiner to get his comments.

It is submitted that this amendment overcomes all of the technical objections raised in the Office Action. If not the Examiner is most courteously solicited to telephone the undersigned as it is believed that that would expedite the resolution of any remaining formal issues.

Turning now to the art rejection, it is clear that the Examiner understands that the claims are not met by the cited combination. Applicants differ with the Examiner on his position that repositioning the indentations to the outer periphery of the core would be obvious as involving only a design choice. All of the prior art positions the indentations within the center area of the circular core portion. This is done primarily because it is easier and does not require as much precision. However applicants have discovered that such positioning adversely effects the magnetic flux lines and thus deteriorates the performance of the machine. Thus this constitutes more than a mere design choice, but presents a significant step forward in the art. The Examiner is, therefore, most courteously solicited to reconsider and withdraw his rejection on this basis.

As to the drawing objection, applicants attach two sketches of enlarged views of the embodiments of FIGS. 1 and 3. It is believed that these will overcome the Examiner's objection, which is well taken. If the Examiner agrees, they will be added to the application and the specification amended accordingly.

Favorable action is most respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted:

Ernest A. Beutler
Reg. No. 19901

Phone (949) 717 4821
Pacific Time

Attachment: Proposed added drawing sheet